



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/441,271 11/16/99 MEYERS

S 6064-11

EXAMINER

TM01/0605

NOKIA INC.
6000 CONNECTION DRIVE
IRVING TX 75039

NGUYEN, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2674

DATE MAILED:

06/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/441,271

Applicant(s)

MEYERS ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin M. Nguyen

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

2. Claims 1, 9-14, 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reavey et al (5,847,698).

3. As to claims 1, 9-14, 16, 17, Reavey et al teaches an electronic book having a display screen 15, a cover 20, PCMCIA card 50 (figure 1), a cover 20 electronically connects single panel screen 15 (col. 4, lines 51-52), a cover 20 inherently does not connect single panel screen 15, then a display of screen 15 is not viewably in display.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 15, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reavey et al in view of Tuttle (5,776,278).

6. As to claims 2, 3, 18, Reavey et al teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for an electronic code is stored in an integrated circuit. However, Tuttle

teaches a ~~tag having an integrated circuit chip~~. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a tag IC chip taught by Reavey et al in the electronic book of Tuttle's system because this would allow the user to entry a secured information.

7. As to claims 6 and 7, Tuttle teaches a tag IC is radio frequency.

8. As to claim 15, Reavey et al teaches modem cards (col. 8, line 1).

9. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reavey et al in view of Post et al (1997 IEEE).

10. As to claims 4 and 5, Reavey et al teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for a cover is fabric or paper. However, Post et al teaches a smart fabric having a circuit fabricated (page 167). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a smart fabric taught by Post et al in the electronic book of Reavey's system because this would allow the user to provide a fabric or paper cover on an electronic book.

11. Claims 19, 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reavey et al in view of Tuttle (5,776,278).

12. As to claims 19, 20 and 22, Reavey et al teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for an electronic code is stored in an integrated circuit. However, Tuttle teaches a tag having an integrated circuit chip. An integrated circuit chip inherently contains a pointer. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a tag IC chip taught by Reavey et al in the electronic

book of Tuttle's system because this would allow the user to entry a secured information.

13. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reavey et al in view of Post et al (1997 IEEE).

14. As to claim 21, Reavey et al teaches all of the claimed limitations of claim 1, except for a cover is fabric or paper. However, Post et al teaches a smart fabric having a circuit fabricated (page 167). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a smart fabric taught by Post et al in the electronic book of Reavey's system because this would allow the user to provide a fabric or paper cover on any electronic books.

15. As to claims 23-40, refer to the previous rejections as applied to claims 1-22.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892 form.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin M. Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-6209. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 9:00-5:00 with alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard A Hjerpe can be reached on 703-305-4709. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-

Application/Control Number: 09/441,271
Art Unit: 2674

Page 5

872-9314 for regular communications and 703-306-0377 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

Kevin M. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2674

KN
May 31, 2001

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Hjerpe', is positioned above the printed name and title.

RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600